

a most painful choice. It could, on the one hand, remove these 13,000 to 14,000 from eligibility for medicaid because their income is somewhat above the payment levels and the State is constitutionally prohibited from supplementing up to the new levels, or could keep them on the medicaid rolls and it would then have to forfeit all of the Federal money it receives for all medicaid recipients in the State.

I should add that the State legislature has attempted to remedy this situation. The State legislature attempted to appropriate State funds to take care of some of the needs of people made eligible by the SSI program; however, they were told by the Attorney General's office that such a move would not be constitutional, since no Federal funds would be matching State appropriations.

I should also add that there was an attempt to repeal this entire section of the State constitution, but it failed in an election in May 1971. In addition, there will be a constitutional convention next year, and the State director of public welfare is convinced that this provision then will be removed from State law.

My amendment is very narrowly drawn and says that the mandatory supplementation provisions of this bill will not apply to a State, but only on two very limited conditions: first, the State constitutional prohibition against supplementation must have been in existence prior to July 1, 1973, and second, the State Attorney General or other appropriate State officials must have made a finding prior to July 1, 1973 that State supplemental payments would not be possible because of the constitutional limitations.

I believe there are sufficient safeguards in this amendment to insure that there will be no abuses. My State has made efforts to overcome this constitutional difficulty, and I know that in the next year serious efforts will be made to correct it.

I am hopeful that the manager of the bill can accept this amendment.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I was part of the discussion of this problem in committee. I recognize it is an unusual and unique problem affecting only the State of Texas and it is caused by the constitution of the State of Texas. I am delighted that the Senator from Texas found a solution for the problem.

However, for the record I have to say that I think this is not the bill on which the amendment should be offered. I realize that it will be agreed to, but to keep my amateur status I will have to indicate my opposition to the amendment on this bill, although I do support the proposal.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, in view of the statement of the Senator from Texas, I do not think there will be more than a relatively small number of cases of individuals in Texas who would have difficulty complying with the committee amendment. Unfortunately, Texas has an unusual constitutional problem that does not exist in other parts of the country. As much as the legislature and the Governor of the State might wish to take

the appropriate action, it looks as though it may be beyond the capacity of the State legislature and the Governor to provide the cooperation this bill would require in complying with the mandate the Senate has adopted. Unless we can work out a better answer, I think we should agree to the amendment, which will solve the problem.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BENTSEN. I thank the Senator. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk and I ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The amendment was read as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

TITLE V—LIMITATION OF USE ON APPROPRIATED FUNDS

PROHIBITION AGAINST USE OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR COMBAT ACTIVITIES IN CAMBODIA AND LAOS

SEC. 501. No funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated under any Act of Congress may be obligated or expended to support directly or indirectly combat activities in, over, or from off the shores of Cambodia or in or over Laos by United States forces.

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, this amendment is similar to and almost identical to an amendment passed by the Senate 3 weeks ago.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EAGLETON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I hope the Senator will not take an extended period of time to debate the amendment. I am confident the Senate will vote the same as they did when the Senator offered the amendment on the other bill that was vetoed.

Mr. EAGLETON. I will be brief but I think we should have the Record complete.

Mr. LONG. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. EAGLETON. I thank the Senator. I will be brief and to the point.

Mr. President, this amendment is similar to and almost identical to an amendment which the Senate passed on May 31 by a vote of 63 to 19, which would prohibit the use of any Federal funds to conduct or continue combat activities in Cambodia and Laos. This amendment was subsequently agreed to and accepted by the House and became part of the Supplemental Appropriation bill. The Supplemental Appropriation bill was vetoed this morning by the President, and the override on the veto failed by 241 to override and 173 to sustain.

Mr. President, I think it is necessary that we persist in this endeavor to bring this unconstitutional and unauthorized war to a termination. There is no authority whatsoever for what is being done

in Cambodia today, and being done with a vengeance.

Since May 31, the date on which the original Eagleton amendment was adopted by the Senate, the following has occurred in Cambodia with respect to American casualties:

June 5, OV-10 downed, one killed in action.

June 15, HH-53 helicopter downed, three killed, two rescued.

June 16, F-4 downed, two missing in action.

Totals killed in Cambodia and Laos to date: six killed in action, four missing in action in Cambodia. Eight killed in action in Laos.

Mr. President, more tonnage has been dropped on Cambodia since the ceasefire was signed on January 27 than was dropped over North Vietnam in the last 3 years. Think of that, in less than half a year we have dropped more bombs on Cambodia and inflicted more devastation, than we had in the entire 3 prior years with respect to North Vietnam.

I think President Nixon's veto of the supplemental appropriation bill hinged mainly on the inclusion of the anti-bombing amendment. He clearly wishes to continue a bombing policy which is improvident, unwise, and goes directly to the heart of the constitutional process. It is our authority—Congress' authority—to determine how, when, and where we go to war; and in the supplemental appropriation bill there was a clear determination by the Congress, both Houses concurring therein, that we not go to war in Cambodia and that we not continue the bombing any longer.

If the President wishes to persist in his methodology, we must persist in ours. Because if we give in on this issue, we will then, by indirection, in my judgment, be sanctioning a war in Cambodia.

If we succumb and delete the anti-bombing amendment from any appropriate vehicle by which it may reach the President's desk, if we recede from that amendment, we are tacitly and affirmatively going along with this war—a war which has no basis in logic or in law.

As far as I am concerned, this amendment has the same legitimacy, the same compelling need, the same efficacy today in June as it had on May 31 when it was originally adopted.

Unless there is something further, I am prepared to yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Earlier in the debate I pointed out that there was grave doubt about the ability of the House to tack this kind of amendment on a bill which, under the Constitution, has to originate in the House. I think there will be a point of order automatically made against this kind of amendment on this bill, regardless of its merits. I expect to vote against it for that reason, but I want the record to show that this is a revenue bill, subject to the constitutional point which requires revenue measures to originate in the House. Moreover, this amendment is completely outside the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee, with which we must go to conference, and I think

June 27, 1973

they have no choice but to reject it on that ground.

Now I would like to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield on the bill itself?

Mr. BENNETT. This is on the amendment.

Will the Senator from Louisiana yield the Senator some time?

Mr. LONG. How much time does the Senator from New Mexico want? Is 5 minutes sufficient?

Mr. DOMENICI. Five minutes will do.

Mr. LONG. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Missouri that a few days ago, when the so-called Eagleton amendment came before the Senate, I supported it, and I want the Senator from Missouri to know, and I want all Senators to know, that I support the concept of prohibiting air action in Cambodia. However, I will not support the amendment today because I think it is inappropriate that it be attached to this measure. In fact, I doubt that I will support any measure other than those that the Finance Committee itself considered as part of this bill.

They have brought before us amendments that are truly relevant. Because we have no budgetary procedures in Congress, they saw fit to remind us of deficiencies in social security, supplemental income, and the like, and I support them because they are either from trust funds or they are relevant to the subject matter. But the pending amendment, it seems to me, is not relevant. I do hope that other Senators will be heard today and that we will not, on this issue, confront the President on this matter and then blame him when the social programs that are part of the bill are not carried out.

So I want the distinguished Senator to know I have not changed my mind with reference to my support as a U.S. Senator, but I have changed my mind with reference to where that amendment should find itself in the procedures of the Senate.

As a freshman, I came here thinking we could really vote on priorities in the Senate, and I find myself voting on many, many billions of dollars added on to a debt limitation bill.

I have just one last thought. Unless and until we devise a method for budgeting, we are not going to have priorities that are meaningful. They will be nothing more than opportunities for those of us who disagree to say if we had a priority system we would vote differently; we would not agree with the President; we would not agree with the Senator from Louisiana. But I doubt that we really want a budgetary system which permits us to vote fair and square, up and down, on priorities. That is the second point that concerns me about today's deliberations.

However, so the Senator from Missouri will understand, I have not changed my mind on this issue, but I will not support his amendment today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I do not think there is anything to be gained by further debate. I do think we would do well to move ahead with the business before the Senate. I hope other Senators will not ask for any more time on this question. I suggest we get to a vote. I am prepared to yield back my time.

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I just have a few brief remarks, and then I am prepared to yield back my time, as well.

The Senator from New Mexico raised the question of the propriety of offering this amendment to this particular bill which raises the debt ceiling. So far as I am concerned, I can think of nothing more appropriate to attach to this bill than an amendment which would prohibit the unauthorized, illegal, and expensive bombing of Cambodia—and in this context I stress the word "expensive."

Last year almost \$10 billion was spent for combat activities and support in Southeast Asia. Had that expenditure not occurred, perhaps we would not be here today attempting to raise the debt ceiling. Annual expenditures as a result of the bombing in Cambodia are estimated at over a billion dollars. That expense will add greatly to the debt ceiling of our Government. So I think it is relevant to be debating at the present time an amendment to prohibit such bombing—when we are discussing priorities and how much further we should go into debt—when we are going further into debt as a result of a bloody war in which we should never have been involved and from which we should immediately extricate ourselves.

So far as I am concerned, I can think of no more appropriate bill to attach an amendment to discontinue the bombing in Cambodia.

I am prepared to yield back my time.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I was engaged in other matters at the time the majority leader made his statement. I asked that his remarks be available to me, so I could read them.

He said

If the veto is upheld, it would be our intention—I repeat—to attach similar Cambodian riders to every other possible piece of legislation, and we will do it, because under the Constitution only the Congress has been given the war-making power, not the President, and Congress has spoken.

I assume that represents the views of the leadership on this side of the aisle. It is not my view, but it is the view of the majority leadership and a majority of the Senate. If that is what the Senate wants to do, they have the votes to do it.

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, before the Senator yields back his time, I am informed that the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGovern) wishes me to yield some time to him to speak on the measure. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I simply want to take a moment to commend the Senator from Missouri for again offering what I think is an eminently sensible proposal at a time when we are talking about the fiscal integrity of the Government. We should make one more effort in the Senate to put an end to this senseless bombing of Cambodia and Laos.

I remember years ago when former Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon, used to speak in this Chamber against the war that he frequently referred to the war as the Johnson war or the McNamara war. It used to bother me that anyone's name was attached to the war at a time when we could not get a majority in Congress to announce its opposition to it. However, all of that is finished now. The Senate has previously voted by a majority of 63 to 19 in favor of terminating any further military operations on or over Cambodia and Laos—more than a 3-to-1 margin on the part of the Senate to bring this bombing to an end.

Now, to whatever extent the Senate has any constitutional responsibility or right to advise and consent on matters of foreign policy, the Senate has made it very clear on a bipartisan basis that it does not support the continued aerial bombardment of these little countries of Cambodia and Laos. We have made that overwhelmingly clear.

The Eagleton amendment, when offered in committee, was passed by a vote of 24 to 0. There was not one single dissenting vote against the amendment. Not one Democrat and not one Republican voted against the amendment.

People who at an earlier time had supported the war now make it unequivocally clear that they oppose it. We want to have all of the war operations terminated.

The amendment previously passed on the floor of the Senate by a vote of 63 to 19. In the House of Representatives it passed by a strong majority. The record is clear. An overwhelming majority of both the House and Senate voted to have the war terminated and to have the bombing over Cambodia and Laos ended.

As far as I am concerned, from here on out, this is Nixon's war. This is a Presidential war being conducted in clear defiance of the overwhelming expression of opinion of the Members of the Congress of the United States.

I think that the President and the American people ought to understand from here on out where the responsibility lies.

I thank the Senator for yielding me time.

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield me time on the bill?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I know how the vote is going to come out. And I know that no amount of debate is going to change the result. However, I will not sit here and hear this referred to as Nixon's war. He had nothing to do with getting the war started. He has extricated us from Southeast Asia with honor. He is trying to assure now that we will have peace and that we do have a position from which to negotiate serious observations in compliance with the terms of the Paris accords.

I therefore think that the Eagleton amendment is something that is calcu-

June 27, 1973

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 12173

lated to perpetuate the war in South-east Asia. Let us call it what it is, and that is Congress' war.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the war in Vietnam has gone on for 10 years. President Nixon finally brought the war to an end. Why should we crowd him now? Why should we not give him a little elbow room in which to negotiate?

The President just threw one bill back here, the second supplemental appropriations bill, on the ground that it contained the Cambodia amendment.

If we wish to play politics with the bill, this is the way to do it. If we want to be patient, that is one thing. However, if we want to play around and try to put the President on the spot, that is another thing. If we want to take the position that we are determined to do anything to make our point, this is the right approach.

I hope the Senate will vote down the amendment. It has no place in the bill. It can do nothing but extend the war 10 years after 50,000 men have been killed and 300,000 men have been wounded.

We should reject the amendment and let them negotiate and enforce the cease-fire which President Nixon has brought about. We would then be doing the country a great service. Any other course, in my judgment, can result only in great detriment to the welfare of the Nation.

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, just briefly, I wish to point out that this is most certainly, Nixon's war in Cambodia. It is a war that is being waged by the President without the authority of Congress. It is heating up. It is not toning down. This is not something that is going to go away in the twilight hours.

I read to the Senate earlier the casualties that have occurred in Cambodia. As we prolong the consideration of this measure, the casualties will surely increase.

Yesterday, for the first time, Russian surface-to-air, heat-seeking missiles were reported as being used against our planes over Cambodia. With the risks that we are taking every day, there is a higher risk of death and a risk, that we will add to the list of missing in action, and possibly even incur a new prisoner of war. It is a risk that Congress can refuse to take. If the President does not see fit to do it, it is our responsibility to determine how and when we should get out of this war.

We exercise that responsibility in a reasonable manner in cutting off funds for Cambodia. We must continue to do everything in our power so that our voices and pleas will be heeded.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, let me say that I recognize that this amendment, if agreed to, means a very serious confrontation between the legislative and the

executive branches, assuming that the House sees fit to agree to the amendment, as it did on a previous occasion.

If it is a confrontation that the sponsors of the amendment are seeking, this is the right bill to which to attach it. I will not vote for the amendment. If it is agreed to, I will do my duty and will support it in conference and will see to it that the House has an opportunity to vote on it.

Mr. President, I heard what the majority leader has said. I thought I heard him correctly, and I respect the right of those who feel that there should be a confrontation on a bill that the President either has to sign or dire consequences will otherwise flow therefrom. If that is what they want to do, this is the bill.

I recognize that any Senator has a right to offer an amendment. He is certainly privileged to offer it to this bill.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. CLARK) are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Iowa (Mr. CLARK) would vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BROCK) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 29, as follows:

[No. 242 Leg.]

YEAS—67

Abourezk	Gurney	Moss
Aiken	Hart	Muskie
Bayh	Hartke	Nelson
Bentsen	Haskell	Nunn
Bible	Hatfield	Packwood
Brooke	Hathaway	Pastore
Burdick	Hollings	Pearson
Byrd	Huddleston	Pell
Harry F., Jr.	Hughes	Percy
Byrd, Robert C.	Humphrey	Proxmire
Cannon	Inouye	Randolph
Case	Javits	Ribicoff
Chiles	Johnston	Schweiker
Church	Kennedy	Stafford
Cook	Magnuson	Stevens
Cotton	Mansfield	Stevenson
Cranston	Mathias	Symington
Dominick	McClure	Talmadge
Eagleton	McGovern	Tunney
Ervin	McIntyre	Weicker
Fong	Metcalfe	Williams
Fulbright	Mondale	Young
Gravel	Montoya	

NAYS—29

Allen	Eastland	McGee
Baker	Fannin	Roth
Bartlett	Goldwater	Saxbe
Beall	Griffin	Scott, Pa.
Bellmon	Hansen	Scott, Va.
Bennett	Helms	Sparkman
Buckley	Hruska	Taft
Curtis	Jackson	Thurmond
Dole	Long	Tower
Domenici	McClellan	

NOT VOTING—4

Biden	Clark	Stennis
Brock		

So Mr. EAGLETON's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk, and I ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill add a new title VI as follows:

SEC. 1. The non-trust fund expenditures of the government of the United States during each fiscal year shall not exceed its revenues from all non-trust sources for such year.

SEC. 2. (a) The President shall submit a budget pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, as amended, in which non-trust fund expenditures do not exceed non-trust fund revenues for each fiscal year.

(b) The provisions of this section may be adjusted to reflect any additional revenues of the government received during a fiscal year resulting from tax legislation enacted after the submission of the budget for such fiscal year.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, my amendment is vitally important if Congress and the administration are ever going to come to grips with inflation and the certainty of a larger and more ominous national debt in the future if we do not act.

Simply put, my amendment would provide that the Federal Government shall not spend Federal funds for nontrust fund items in excess of the revenues collected by the Federal Government from nontrust fund sources during any given fiscal year.

My amendment also requires that the President submit a budget in which non-trust fund receipts and expenditures are strictly balanced.

If we are serious about controlling inflation and eliminating the prospect of an increasing national debt in the future, then the Senate must face up to the facts regarding deficit spending in the last 4 fiscal years.

From the beginning of fiscal year 1970 through the end of the current fiscal year 1973, the Federal funds area of the unified budget has run a deficit during just these 4 fiscal years, of approximately \$100 billion. Senators know that the unified budget procedure tends to obscure the real impact of deficit Federal spending by offsetting trust fund surpluses against nontrust fund deficits. This \$100 billion deficit in the last 4 fiscal years has meant that the Federal Government was spending \$100 billion more for the operation of Government than it was receiving in Federal taxes. Truly, no Senator can ignore the impact that this \$100 billion in deficit Federal spending has had upon our economy in these past 4 years. It has been the primary stimulus for the inflation which has seriously eroded the purchasing power of the dollar both at home and abroad.

We have heard a good deal of rhetoric

over the need to do something about inflation. We have heard the same rhetoric over the need to control and limit the national debt. Well, Mr. President, here is an opportunity to take some action, to face up to the danger that reckless Federal spending has presented to our Nation's economic security, and to protect against future increases in the national debt.

Controls on wages and prices and every other element in our economy will never stop inflation because these controls are not directed at the cause of inflation. There is no question that it will be difficult for some Senators to commit themselves to a balanced Federal budget, because such a budget will necessitate cutting down substantially on Federal expenditures. But I am firmly convinced that an overwhelming majority of the American people would rather see the Government spend less, thereby stopping this inflation, than to see larger and larger Federal deficits being spent with money that inflation has made practically worthless.

I urge Senators to consider this amendment seriously and to adopt it. I am convinced that it is the first step down the road toward eliminating inflation and establishing a firm foundation for a stable economy in this country.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, if I understand the amendment correctly—and I have been studying it with a capable staff—it would require a \$19 billion cut in the Federal funds deficit that exists in the present budget. In other words the Senator from North Carolina is seeking to eliminate the deficit on a Federal funds basis. That means a \$19 billion cut in spending, which would be more than balancing the budget; it would be more than resisting inflation.

While the Senator, of course, has very practical objectives, a sudden shift of Federal activities of the size of a \$19 billion cut in Federal funds outlays, would, I think, cause such a drastic shock on the economy that it really could not be sustained.

When we have a \$16 billion surplus in our trust fund, if the Federal Government is running a \$16 billion deficit in Federal funds, it still is not the Federal Government that is creating inflation, because the Federal Government pulls as much money out of circulation as it is putting back into circulation.

This matter was studied by President Johnson's administration, which concluded that we ought to have a unified budget. It was studied by the administration of Richard Nixon, and that administration concluded that the unified budget was the best way to handle these accounts.

If we look at the budget action that would have to be considered, we would realize that what the Senator has in mind would be absolutely devastating, when one realizes that there are many things that cannot be cut. We cannot cut the interest on the national debt. We cannot cut social security payments. In the controllable items, such as public

works, a great many national defense items, education programs, programs that are most meaningful to the American people, and to their communities, it would mean a cut of some \$20 billion. Controllable programs cannot be cut that much and continue to be effective.

Mr. President, the Senator has a very noble purpose in mind. I think, however, that, if anyone had the experience of living with this, he would have a great deal of explaining to do to his constituents—when they saw what was recommended by the President, passed by the House, and what the Senate then proposed to do, if the Senate could prevail on it.

I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. I think the consequences would be a shock, with an adverse reaction to the country when the people felt the impact of it. A sharp recession or depression sponsored by the Federal Government would be such that the Senate would regret the day it adopted the amendment, if indeed we were able to prevail upon the House and the administration to implement it.

At this point, Mr. BARTLETT assumed the chair.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 2 minutes?

Mr. LONG. I control the time in opposition.

Mr. DOMENICI. I am on the Senator's side.

Mr. LONG. Then I yield the Senator 2 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina that I am not going to do this before every vote, but it seems to me that in fairness, since I rose to object to the Cambodian proposal as being irrelevant and putting the Senate on the spot—having to vote on something that really was not germane to what the Committee on Finance had considered—I raise the same issue with respect to the Senator's amendment.

I must tell the distinguished Senator, as I said to the Senator from Missouri, that, although I agree in concept with the premise—as I did with the Senator from Missouri's proposal about Cambodia—I will not vote for it, in spite of the fact that I am beginning to think there is no other way to control the budget, no orderly way. There really is no priority way to vote, because we do not want such a system here.

I still cannot vote for a \$19 billion cut, as explained by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. I do not think it is relevant to the issue. I compliment the Senator on the thesis and the theory, but I want him to know why I will not vote for his amendment on this occasion.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the distinguished Senator, my seatmate and my friend.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield? I am going to vote with the Senator from Louisiana, although I am in agreement with the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from North Carolina for offering this amendment. I agree wholeheartedly that it is

needed to bring fiscal responsibility to the Federal Government.

Moreover, I am the author of a proposed constitutional amendment which would require a balanced budget over a 2-year fiscal period. However, I believe that such an amendment would not be proper on this bill.

While I fully agree with the substance of the amendment, I cannot support it at this time. I regret that I cannot do so. I hope that at a future time, if it is not agreed to now, I can join the Senator on such an amendment.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for yielding.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I think that all of us in the Senate should remember that a process has begun through which Congress can take back the responsibility for budget priorities. The Joint Study Committee was set up. It studied the problem. It recommended a program. We are waiting for Senator METCALF's subcommittee and for the House to act on the recommended procedure. I think that when a procedure is approved and Congress begins to accept the responsibility for responsible budgetary action, many of these rather harsh proposals will become unnecessary.

I am in the agreement with the objective of the Senator, that we must get control of the budgetary process and that we must begin to move toward a balanced budget. But, in the spirit of this particular bill, I think an attempt to approach it from the point of view suggested by the Senator is not the right way to do it. So, while I am in support of his objective, I must oppose the amendment, both in view of the procedure that is already on its way through Congress and the limitations of this particular bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOMENICI). Who yields time?

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. HELMS. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Virginia such time as he desires.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I favor the concept of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina. It seems to me that sooner or later—the sooner the better—we must get to a balanced budget concept. We cannot continue these huge deficits. The people of this country are suffering by this. The huge deficits are the major cause for the tremendous inflation that is eating so heavily into the paycheck of the workingman and the grocery dollar of every housewife.

The amendment offered by the able Senator from North Carolina is directed toward helping solve the question of rampaging inflation.

The Senator from Louisiana made a very important point, I think, and one that must be considered. I wonder whether the Senator from North Carolina would consider modifying his proposal to make it effective with the fiscal year 1975—that is, with the new budget which will be submitted by the admin-